



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

nounced in the newspapers of 1771-1774, when Irish emigration was especially abundant, 329, or 57 per cent., sailed from or to Cork, Dublin, and other southern ports. And he seems to be an honest calculator, if not always critical. By accumulation of instances he indicates the presence of many thousands of Irish in Massachusetts before 1790; and yet the *Boston Directory* of 1789, among its 1300 or 1400 names, contains not forty of those that Mr. O'Brien lists as peculiarly Irish—not an O, and only three Mac's that are not plainly Scottish. All these questions are more difficult than he seems to think, and what is said about them in the Census Bureau volume, *A Century of Population Growth*, though naturally quoted by many as authoritative, is in reality fundamentally erroneous.

An appendix contains a list of 1500 Revolutionary officers of Irish birth or descent that Mr. O'Brien says he has found. The list is not carefully composed and it is subject to a good deal of reduction; 73 of them were in the French-Irish regiments, 80 were "officers" on privateers, 70 or more seem to be pretty certainly duplicates. Mr. O'Brien will hardly maintain that "James Mease, Commissary, Penna. Troops", and "James Mease, Paymaster and Treasurer, Continental Army", are two distinct persons, or that the officers of the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot all became new persons when its name is changed to Thirteenth Pennsylvania. As to establishing any ratio, the reviewer knows of no complete list of officers in the Revolutionary army, but of commissioned officers who served in the United States navy and marine corps in the Revolutionary War there are authoritative lists. These officers number 304, and only five of them are in Mr. O'Brien's list of officers. Another long appendix lists all the non-commissioned officers and enlisted men, of the twelve chief Irish names, that Mr. O'Brien has found in the Revolutionary army and navy. He says (p. 218) that no individual name has been repeated; but this, for reasons indicated above, cannot be true.

To sum up: Mr. O'Brien has produced a book of considerable value, but if his object is not simply to edify the Irish-American, but to convince thoughtful persons not Irish, he would have assured a more permanent position to his book by sifting his evidence more carefully and not claiming so much.

J. F. JAMESON.

*The Last of the "Mayflower"*. By RENDEL HARRIS. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. 122. 5s.)

*The Finding of the "Mayflower"*. By RENDEL HARRIS. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1920. Pp. v, 58. 4s. 6d.)

THESE two books, written by a distinguished scholar, showing an extraordinary amount of research and study on the interesting problem

of what became of the Pilgrims' ship, the *Mayflower*, and both published in the same year, illustrate in a curious way how conjecture and probabilities can be used to supply the place of definitive evidence.

In the volume first printed, *The Last of the Mayflower*, Dr. Harris claims to have established that among the ships which sailed for New England in 1629 and again in 1630 was the *Mayflower* of 1620, and that as late as 1653 the same ship was employed in carrying to Boston goods for John Eliot. He submits letters from John Eliot and a bill of lading of 1653, described as "Invoyce of Goods Sente on the May Flower of Boston (Master Thos. Webber) for Boston in New England consigned unto Mr. John Elliott Paster the Church of Roxbury", etc., and devotes nearly sixty pages to prove that the *Mayflower* is also the ship of Thomas Horth of Yarmouth and engaged in the Greenland whale-fishery, and is also the ship whose owner and master in her last days was Thomas Webber of Boston. He states his conclusion: "It is very doubtful if anything more is to be said as to the fate of the *Mayflower*. We traced her to Boston and to the year 1654. . . . Most likely she was broken up in Boston or perhaps in the Thames on her last voyage to London."

In the *English Historical Review* for October, 1904, in an article entitled "The *Mayflower*", by R. G. Marsden, it is shown with many illustrative references that the name *Mayflower* was a very common name in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. "There could not have been fewer than forty or fifty *Mayflowers* existing between 1550 and 1700, and some of the larger ports of the Kingdom of England possessed two or even several *Mayflowers* apiece."

The most satisfactory evidence as to the fate of the *Mayflower* is found in an application made to the Admiralty Court on May 4, 1624, by the owners of three-fourths of the *Mayflower*, including the widow of Christopher Jones, for her appraisement. The appraisal was made by two mariners and two shipwrights, and the basis of the application for the appraisement of the *Mayflower* was the fact the she was "in ruinis".

Dr. Harris disposes of that appraisal upon an explanation which to him seems very simple, that the appraisal is for the widow's fourth part and not for the whole ship; but an examination of the appraisal indicates conclusively that the valuation of fifty pounds which the appraisers fixed was for the whole ship, for they say in terms that "having viewed and seene the Hull, mastes yardes boate Winles and capstan of and belonging to the said shipp", they do estimate the same at fifty pounds. They also estimate the value of the five anchors, one suite of sails, three cables, two hawsers, shrouds, and stays, with all the other rigging. That clearly is not a valuation of the widow Jones's fourth of the vessel but the valuation of the entire ship, a ship whose usefulness was ended and beyond repair, a ship "in ruinis".

Until some further evidence is introduced which overturns this record, it seems to be clearly established that the year 1624 saw the last

of the *Mayflower*. The interesting speculations then as to whether the *Mayflower* was in the East Indies or later a whaler, or whether it could be identified with Mr. Webber's *Mayflower* or Mr. Vassal's *Mayflower*, are of little real importance.

It is unnecessary to discuss the meaning and effect of the appraisalment of the *Mayflower*, and whether the allegation in the petition for appraisalment that the *Mayflower* is "in ruins" means that the vessel is already broken up and never again to sail the seas, for in *The Finding of the "Mayflower"*, Dr. Harris bases his argument in support of the discovery of the timbers of the *Mayflower* upon the fact that the *Mayflower* was broken up in 1624. The earlier book rests on the author's assumption that the "appraisalment is for the widow's fourth part and not for the whole ship", and the later book, upon the undoubted and admitted fact that the appraisalment is for the entire ship.

In *The Finding of the "Mayflower"*, which volume he describes "as the culmination and crown of my researches into the story of the Pilgrim Fathers", his thesis is to establish that the timbers of the *Mayflower* now form part of the timbers of an old barn at Jordans in the county of Bucks. The direct evidence in support of his conclusions may be briefly summarized: (1) that the *Mayflower* was broken up in 1624; (2) that at that date the barn was built; (3) that the timbers of the barn are ship-timbers; (4) that the timbers are timbers of the ship *Mayflower* because, (a) the cracked mainbeam of the barn "is the cracked beam of the original *Mayflower*", (b) the inscription on a beam in the wall of the barn contains the letters—R. H A R—I C—which he interprets to have originally been MAYFLOWER, HARWICH, and (c) the carvings on an old door in the house "of what appears to be a rose".

If we take these claims in their order it will be easily seen that on the evidence submitted they rest on conjecture and hope, not on real proof. No evidence is furnished to show the date when the barn was built except the opinion of a Thames shipbuilder that it was built "more than two hundred years ago", and the fact that the bricks in the foundation measure  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4} \times 2\frac{3}{8}$  inches, which do not correspond to the regulation size of bricks in the seventeenth century, and which discrepancy he explains by the suggestion that these bricks "are earlier in date than the operating control" or were "imported bricks, say from Holland". The same shipbuilder is relied on as a witness to establish the fact that the timbers and beams are from "old ships' beams and frames", and he estimates the dimensions of the "Schooner" from which the timber came to be "about 90 ft. long, 22 ft. wide and 10 ft. deep and would carry about 150 tons". The testimony of his expert seems to dispose of the theory that the cracked beam "is the great beam in the *Mayflower*". His conclusion is that the crack "is a natural 'windshake'", and "must have been put on at the time of the construction of the barn". Dr. Harris

frankly recognizes the weight of the expert's opinion and states that "we must not too hastily identify the crossbeam of the barn with the great beam amidship of the *Mayflower*".

The inscription has little persuasive force. His photographer, "a man of very quick vision", who was with him at the time of the discovery of the inscription, quickly read it as R. HARRIS. It might be a fair inference that the photographer was also somewhat of a joker, but Dr. Harris takes him seriously, and at a "somewhat later date" Dr. Harris determines the letters of the mysterious alphabetic sign to be R. HAR\*I\* and then cheerfully expands it into the necessary lettering for his purpose by adding before the R. the letters MAYFLOWE and in the second word placing the letters W and CH, and the puzzle is solved and we have the hoped-for and looked-for name MAYFLOWER, HARWICH. But the doctor frankly says, "On closer investigation I begin to be sceptical of the letter R which we have suggested to be the terminal of the *Mayflower*."

Nothing material remains to support his hope that he has discovered the timbers of the *Mayflower* except the carvings of a flower on the old door. The photograph of the door which he gives in his book goes far to support the doctor's statement that the carving "is clearly conventional". There is no evidence offered that the door ever came from a ship, and the author's argument is best stated by himself. "If it came from a ship . . . we should expect . . . that the flower had something to do with the ship or her owners. She should be the *Mayflower* or the *Mary Rose* or the *Marigold*."

There is little presented to justify the widely heralded announcement that the timbers of the *Mayflower* have been found in an old English barn. The real value of the book lies in the investigation, very carefully made, which tend to show that one of the owners of the *Mayflower*, Robert Child, lived only a few miles from Jordans, and that Richard Gardiner, a *Mayflower* passenger, may be traced to the same neighborhood.

*The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies.* By BEVERLEY W. BOND, jr., Associate Professor of History in Purdue University. With an Introduction by CHARLES M. ANDREWS. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1919. Pp. 492. \$3.00.)

DR. BOND has singled out for fullness of treatment the whole matter of the quit-rent as one item in the colonial land-system. It is a subject which justifies the exhaustive and careful study which he has given to it. The greater portion of colonial lands were held by feudal tenure, and the quit-rent, the chief bond between lord and tenant, was a payment which reached down and affected the lives of most men. It is a study which goes to the bottom of things. It is comprehensive